

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,811	03/30/2004	Yasuhiro Takeda	57810-095	2835
75	90 12/12/2005		EXAM	INER
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY			LANDAU, MATTHEW C	
600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,			HP
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/811,811	TAKEDA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew Landau	2815	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
·_ ·	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allocation closed in accordance with the practice under	wance except for formal ma	•	
Disposition of Claims			1
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	- 1
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			1
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a line	ents have been received. ents have been received in a priority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	_		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-17, drawn to a semiconductor device, classified in class 257, subclass 394.

II. Claims 18-30, drawn to a method of fabricating a semiconductor device,classified in class 438, subclass 1+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by a materially different process. Regarding claims 18, 21, and 30, the semiconductor device can be made by a process wherein an element is introduced into the various semiconductor regions prior to forming the second conductivity type regions. Regarding claims 24 and 26, the element can be introduced into the insulator films by doping during growth of the insulator or by ion-implanting directly into the insulator.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 2815

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction

Art Unit: 2815

requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

If Applicant elects the invention of Group I, this application is further subject to an election of species requirement as follows:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a. Species I, as shown in Figures 1 and 13.
- b. Species II, as shown in Figure 27.
- c. Species III, as shown in Figure 44.

Page 5

Art Unit: 2815

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, at least claims 1 and 5 are generic.

If Applicant elects the invention of Group II, this application is further subject to an election of species requirement as follows:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a. Species I, as shown in Figures 3-11.
- b. Species II, as shown in Figures 14-26.
- c. Species III, as shown in Figures 30-43.
- d. Species IV, as shown in Figures 45-52.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims appear generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Application/Control Number: 10/811,811

Art Unit: 2815

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew C. Landau whose telephone number is (571) 272-1731.

The examiner can normally be reached from 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker, can be reached on (571) 272-2298. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and (571) 273-8300 for After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Application/Control Number: 10/811,811 Page 7

Art Unit: 2815

may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should any questions arise regarding access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Matthew C. Landau

December 7, 2005